<u>REMARKS</u>

This present Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated June 21, 2007.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of pending claims in view of the above-amendments and the following remarks.

I.   <u>CLAIM AMENDMENTS</u>

Claim 30 is amended to correct a minor typographical error.

Claim 41 is amended to include all the elements of dependent claim 42. Since claim 42 has already been examined, this amendment raises no new issues and the amendment does not affect the scope of any other claims.

Applicants respectfully request that the proposed amendments be entered.

II.   <u>CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER §103(a) BASED ON NEWSOFT AND ZHOU</u>

Claims 1-5, 7-21, 22-23 and 35-41 were rejected under §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over a combination of NewSoft and Zhou.

Applicant's arguments presented in the prior response are incorporated herein in their entireties.

The Office Action suggests that, if the left side of the GUI on page 11 of NewSoft is an object data area and the right side is a form data area, then NewSoft discloses text blocks that are selectable within the object data area for insertion in respective fields of an electronic form. However, the Office Action <u>ignores</u> that, per claim 1, the fields of the electronic form are <u>in the form data area</u> (allegedly the right side of NewSoft). Text blocks from the left side of NewSoft are <u>not</u> insertable into the bitmap image of the business card shown on the right side of the GUI.

A.   **Independent Claim 1**

Independent claim 1 (and similarly independent claim 17 and 30) includes the following limitation (Annotated for reference),

> (c) displaying <u>simultaneously to a user</u> fields of the electronic form in a form data area and the identified text blocks in an object data area that is outside of the form data area, which corresponds to the first object, through a graphical user interface,

wherein the <u>text blocks</u> [<u>in the object data area</u>] are selectable by the user <u>within the object data</u> area through the graphical user interface <u>for insertion</u> into respective <u>fields of the electronic form</u> [<u>in the form data area</u>];

Thus, the form data area and the object data area are displayed simultaneously. The text blocks are selectable within the object data area <u>for insertion</u> into the fields in the <u>form data area</u>, which is <u>displayed simultaneously</u> with the object data area.

A. The Office Action Misapplies the Claim Limitations to NewSoft, Ignoring Positively Recited Claim Limitations

Applicants very much appreciate the detailed response to Applicant's arguments that were provided in the Office Action.

In view of the detailed response, it appears that the analysis provided in the Office Action ignores that the text blocks, which are selectable by the user <u>within the object data</u> area, are inserted into respective fields of the electronic form <u>in the form data area</u> (per the language of claim 1), which is displayed simultaneously with the separate object data area.

Page 11 of NewSoft illustrates a Card Editor Mode, which displays an <u>image</u> of the business card currently being edited on the right pane of the workspace, while the left pane of the workspace displays the fields of the corresponding electronic business card. The Card Editor Mode does not display identified text blocks in an object data area that is outside of a form data area, wherein the text blocks are selectable by the user within the object data area through the graphical data interface for insertion into respective fields of the electronic form. Rather, the Card Editor Mode simply displays what appears to be a bit map image of the scanned business cards.

Section 11 of the Office Action suggests that NewSoft discloses on page 11 a "Card Editor mode" having an object data area (the left side of the GUI) and a form data area (the right side of the GUI displaying the business card). The Office Action suggests the left side of the GUI displays identified text blocks in an object data area, wherein the text blocks are selectable within the object data area ("...add or modify entries.") for insertion into respective fields of the electronic form.

However, this statement <u>ignores</u> that the fields of the electronic form, per claim 1, are <u>in a form data area</u>, which is displayed simultaneously with the object data area from which the text blocks are selected. In the example suggested in the Office Action, the text blocks are in the alleged <u>object data area</u> and <u>not insertable</u> into the alleged <u>form data area</u> (right side of the GUI displaying a bit-map image of the business card).

Accordingly, NewSoft does not disclose a device that is capable of simultaneously displaying to a user fields of an electronic form in a form data area and identified text blocks in an object data area that is outside of the form data area and corresponds to a first object.

The Office Action further states that,

> "the electronic form can be any Card Deck mode on page 10, the electronic form in Card List mode on page 12; the electronic form on the left side of the Card Editor mode on page 11 as they are all updated when the fields are modified."

However, this statement ignores that the limitations of claim 1 require that the fields of the electronic form are displayed in the form data area <u>simultaneously</u> with the identified text blocks in the object data area.

Clearly, NewSoft does not disclose the step of displaying simultaneously to a user fields of the electronic form in a form data area and the identified text blocks in an object data area that is outside of the form data area, wherein the text blocks [in the object data area] are selectable by the user within the object data area through the graphical user interface for insertion into respective fields of the electronic form [in the form data area], as recited in claim 1

B. Zhou

As mentioned in Applicant's previous response, Zhou merely receives a digital image containing one or more image areas and operates to automatically detect image area rectangles for each image area. In each instance, the extracted images are treated simply as images, not objects from which information is identified and used to fill electronic forms.

Zhou does not disclose identifying text blocks within a first object using optical character recognition, as recited in claim 1. Also, Zhou does not disclose simultaneously displaying to a user fields of an electronic form in a form data area and identified text blocks in an object data area, which is outside the form data area and which corresponds to the first object.

Further, Zhou does not disclose that such text blocks could be selectable by the user within the object data area through a graphical user interface for insertion into respective fields of electronic forms.

Zhou also does not disclose the steps of parsing and populating as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, even if the business card scanner of NewSoft were modified according to Zhou, the resulting combination would still fail to disclose or suggest the simultaneous display of a form data area and an object data area as recited in claim 1 or text blocks that are selectable by the user within the object data area for insertion into respective fields of the electronic form in the form data area.

Independent claim 1 and similarly independent claims 17 and 30 are non-obvious in view of these references.

Applicants respectfully request that the claim rejection of independent claims 1, 17 and 30 and their respective dependent claims under §103(a) based on NewSoft and Zhou be withdrawn.

C.   Dependent Claims

Applicants re-iterate the arguments presented in the previous response with respect to the dependent claims.

III.   CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER §103(a) BASED ON NEWSOFT AND ZHOU AND FURTHER IN VIEW OF PANDIPATI

Claim 42 was rejected under §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over the combination of NewSoft, Zhou and further in view of Pandipati.

Claim 41 now incorporates the elements of dependent claim 42. Independent claim 41 is now directed to method of populating electronic forms from an electronic imaging having first and second objects of different information types, wherein the first object comprises a business card and the second object comprises a purchase receipt. The first electronic form comprises a contact record of a software address book and the second electronic form comprises an electronic financial record of a software financial application.

The Office Actions suggests that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to disclose a bill scanner and financial organizer as taught by Pandipati.

However, Pandipati simply disclose a bill scanning system (i.e., system that scan a single type of image).

Neither Pandipati, NewSoft nor Zhou disclose how two separate objects within the same electronic image and having different information types can be identified such that:

> fields in a first electronic form type can be populated with the tagged information elements identified from the sub-image of the first object to produce a first populated form; and

> fields in a second electronic form type can be populated with the tagged information elements identified from the sub-image of the second object to produce a second populated form.

Simply combining the cited references would not teach or enable the use of two different form types or the ability to populate such diverse forms from different objects of the same electronic image.

These elements are certainly not disclosed by any of the cited references, either separately or in combination, and these elements would be non-obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art when looking at these references.

Accordingly, independent claim 41 is new and non-obvious in view of NewSoft and Zhou.

IV.   <u>CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER §103(a) BASED ON NEWSOFT AND ZHOU AND FURTHER IN VIEW OF HUAUG</u>

Claims 6, 22 and 34 were rejected under §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over the combination of NewSoft, Zhou and further in view of Huaug.

Claims 6, 23 and 34 depend from respective independent claims, which are new and non-obvious in view of the recited references discussed above. Accordingly, these claims are also new and non-obvious.

Applicants respectfully request that the various claim rejections under §103(a) be

withdrawn in view of the above-amendments and remarks.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: /David D. Brush/
David D. Brush, Reg. No. 34,557
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
DDB/tkj   Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312